

THE DAILY JOURNAL.

MONDAY, AUGUST 27, 1888.

WASHINGTON OFFICE—513 Fourteenth St.
P. M. HART, Correspondent.NEW YORK OFFICE—104 Temple Court,
Corner Beekman and Nassau streets.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

DAILY.	
One year, without Sunday	\$12.00
One year, with Sunday	14.00
Six months, without Sunday	6.00
Six months, with Sunday	7.00
Three months, without Sunday	3.00
Three months, with Sunday	3.50
One month, without Sunday	1.00
One month, with Sunday	1.20

Reduced Rates to Clubs.

Subscribers with any of our numerous agents, or

send subscriptions to

THE JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Can be found at the following places:

LONDON—American Exchange in Europe, 449

Strand.

PARIS—American Exchange in Paris, 35 Boulevard

des Capucines.

NEW YORK—Giles House and Windsor Hotel.

CHICAGO—Palmer House.

CINCINNATI—J. P. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine street.

LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northwest corner

Third and Jefferson streets.

ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot

and Southern Hotel.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Riggs House and Ebbitt

House.

Telephone Calls.

Business Office, 238; Editorial Rooms, 242

THINGS TO THINK OF.

"The main question at issue [in America]

is ENGLISH FREE TRADE against the CON-

TINENTAL SYSTEM OF PROTECTION. * * *

The American election is infinitely more im-

portant to Englishmen than their own internal

politics just at this juncture. * * * The re-

sult of the American election will help to de-

cide many important issues in Great Britain."

—London Sunday Times, July 15, 1888.

"Protection to home industries I regard as

the most important plank in any platform

after 'the Union' must and shall be pre-

served."—Gen. U. S. Grant, in 1883.

"It is my deliberate judgment that the

prosperity of America is mainly due to her

system of protective laws."—Prince Bismarck.

"We should be slow to abandon that sys-

tem of protective duties which looks to the

promotion and development of American in-

dustry and to the preservation of the highest

possible scale of wages for the American work-

man."—Benjamin Harrison.

"No man's wages should be so low that he

cannot make provisions in his days of vigor

for the incapacity of accident or the feebleness

of old age."—Benjamin Harrison.

"The wages of the American laborer cannot

be reduced except with the consent and the

votes of the American laborer himself. The

appeal lies to him."—James G. Blaine.

"We believe in the preservation of the

American market for our American producers

and workmen."—Benjamin Harrison.

"This is not the time to weigh in an apothec-

ary's scale the services or the rewards of the

men who saved the Nation."—Benjamin Harrison.

"Against whom is it that the Republican

party has been unable to protect your race?"

—Benjamin Harrison to the colored voters.

"Yes, I am a rebel and a Democrat, but I

thank God I have never been a Republican."

—Rev. John A. Brooks, Third-party Prohibition

Candidate for Vice-president.

"We don't want any Republicans in our

country."—Senator Colquhoun and Representative

Stewart, of Georgia.

"And if one receives not enough it is be-

cause he did not serve long enough, and can

be heard to complain if he gets a just rate,

equal to his fellow-soldiers, and for the re-

mainder of the relief necessary to his support,

he shall be allowed, as other citizens must, to

accept the charity of the local authorities."

—C. C. Matson, chairman of House committee

on invalid pensions, in his report on the de-

pendent pension bill, April 14, 1888.

"With President Cleveland Great Britain

knows where she is."—Glasgow Herald.

"The only time England can use an Irish-

man is when he emigrates to America and

votes for free trade."—London Sunday Times,

July 15.

"On the adoption of free trade by the

United States depends the greater share of

English prosperity for a good many years to

come. As the British History Review reit-

erates, 'We venture to assert that England will

reap the largest share of any advantages that

may arise from the adoption of the ideas now

advocated by the free-trade party in the

United States."—London Economist.

"I saw the other day in one of our Indian-

apolis papers a good overcoat advertised for

\$1.87, and it must be a pretty mean man that

wants to get one for a dollar."—Benjamin

Harrison.

"I hold it to be true that whenever the

market price is so low that the man or the

woman who makes an article cannot get a fair

living out of the making of it, it is too low."—

Benjamin Harrison.

"I believe in free trade as I believe in the

Protestant religion."—President Cleveland.

"Grover Cleveland has done more to ad-

vance the cause of free trade than any Prime

Minister of England has ever done."—London

Spectator.

"We [the capitalists] can control the work-

ingman only so long as he eats up to-day what

he earns to-morrow."—W. L. Scott, Mr. Cleve-

land's political manager.

"I have so long followed Mr. Mills that

whatever he commands, I do."—Mr. Bynum,

at Albany.

RIP VAN WINKLE THURMAN is what they

call him now.

WHY does every Democrat and free-trader

show the white feather?

SOME people are beginning to notice that

the streets are torn up.

"THE best part of this bill is the free list.

Wool is the first."—Roger Q. Mills, as re-

ported in the New York Star.

MR. BLAINE'S speech on the President's

fishery message grinds the fat man in the

White House into very fine powder.

SIM COY, Democratic statesman and boss,

though doing time in the penitentiary, still

draws his salary as Counselman from the

Eighteenth ward.

HISTORY repeats itself. Indianapolis was

soted thirty years ago for the finest railroad

lepot in the United States, and when the new

one is completed she will be again.

THE people of Indiana should remember

that the Democracy in this State have fos-

tered the most corrupt partisan clique ever in

existence, whose acts in the benevolent insti-

tutions of Indiana will go down in history as without a parallel. A crime against God and humanity, it will remain one of the blackest pages in the history of our State, forever abhorred by the better class of all parties. It demands rebuke from every voter who is possessed of that noblest of human attributes—sympathy for the unfortunate.

A TRICKY OLD ROMAN.

The country has been led to suppose, or at least efforts have been made to produce the belief that Judge Thurman, Democratic candidate for Vice-president, was much less of a demagogue than the average Democrat, and rather an honorable man. We are prepared to demonstrate that this is a mistake, and that the "Old Roman" is an old fraud. Judge Thurman is as much of a demagogue as any ordinary Democratic stump-speaker, and not above garbling and misrepresenting the record to make a point for a free-trade argument. In his speech at Port Huron, Mich., he did so garble and misrepresent the record, and did it knowingly, deliberately and fraudulently, as follows:

At Port Huron, as at Toledo, he stated that a tariff duty was simply a tax, and that it was paid by the consumer. This statement has only a modicum of truth in it, but let that pass. In support of it Mr. Thurman cited John Quincy Adams, whom he complimented as a great and good man. Pretending to quote from Mr. Adams, Mr. Thurman said:

"The doctrine that duties of import seem to cheapen the price of the articles on which they are levied, seems to conflict with the first dicta of common sense. The duty constitutes a part of the price of the whole mass of the article in the market. It is substantially paid upon the article of domestic manufacture as well as upon that of foreign production. Upon one it is a bounty; upon the other a burden; and the repeal of the tax must operate as an equivalent reduction of the price of the articles, whether foreign or domestic. We say so, as the importation continues, the duty must be paid by the purchaser of the article. The general and permanent effect must be to increase the price of the article to the extent of additional duty, and it is then paid by the consumer. If it were not so, if the general effect of adding to the duty was to reduce the price of the article upon which it is levied, the converse of the proposition would also be true, and the operation for increasing the price of the domestic article would be to reap the duty on the same article imported, an experiment which the friends of our industrial industry will not be desirous of making. We cannot subscribe, therefore, to the doctrine that the duties of imports, protective of our own manufacturers, are paid by the foreign merchant or manufacturer."

This pretended quotation is from a "Report on Manufactures," made by Mr. Adams in Congress, May 22, 1832. The pretended quotation is a garbled extract. As made by Mr. Thurman, it purports to be a continuous extract and there is nothing to indicate that anything was omitted. "et he omitted sentences materially modifying the sense. Between the first and second sentences, as quoted by Mr. Thurman, he omitted a passage beginning as follows:

"But its supporters first appeal with confidence to the fact that most of the articles upon which additional duties were levied by the tariff of 1828 have since that time continued to fall in price—and then they argue that it must be so by the excitement of competition in the market. It is certainly contrary to the natural course of things that an addition to the cost should be a reduction of the price of the article."

Again, after the sentence ending with the words "paid by the purchaser of the article," Mr. Thurman omitted the following sentences:

"Some portion of it, however, is for a short interval of time paid by the foreigner, against whose trade the domestic competition is brought forward. It affects him as a reduction of his profits, which endures for a time, but under the pressure of which he is finally compelled to withdraw from the market. While the struggle continues the duty is paid by the foreigner or by the importing merchant here. The purchaser and consumer here are relieved from the burden of the duty, and may perhaps obtain the goods cheaper than if they were exonerated from the duty altogether. But this relief is purchased by injustice, at the expense not only of the foreign manufacturer, but of the importing merchant, till the duty becomes prohibitory."

In these sentences Mr. Adams virtually denied what Mr. Thurman tried to make him assert, viz: that a tariff duty was a tax, and that it was paid by the consumer.

Again, Mr. Adams said, in sentences not quoted by Mr. Thurman:

"We may, and probably do, often greatly exaggerate to ourselves the immensity of exertions and of sacrifices made by the British manufacturers to retain and preserve in their own hands the control of foreign markets. But that such exertions and sacrifices are made, and will be made by large manufacturing establishments, in which extensive capitals are employed, cannot be doubted. Whenever they are made, and so long as they are continued, to counteract the effect of tariff duties on foreign countries, the duties are paid by them and the purchaser of the goods in the foreign country obtains them freed from the duty, at the expense of the foreign manufacturer. But this career of losing trade cannot continue long."

This, again, is an admission by Mr. Adams that a protective tariff tax, unless prohibitory, is paid by the foreign manufacturer and not by the purchaser. Mr. Adams was not arguing against protective but against prohibitory duties. He was in favor of a protective tariff, and was only defeated for re-election as President by Andrew Jackson because the latter was even a more pronounced protectionist than Adams. Mr. Thurman tries to make it appear that Adams was opposed to protection, and in doing this garbles his report and suppresses important passages. The "noble old Roman" is a plain, common demagogue.

MR. BASS'S VIEWS ON THE TARIFF.

The Sentinel publishes an interview with Mr. John H. Bass, of Fort Wayne, on some phases of the tariff question, and editorially commends his views to the public as "those of a level-headed, sagacious, practical man of affairs, who knows just what he is talking about, and who has as large a stake in the material welfare of the country as any other man in Indiana." Mr. Bass is elected-at-large on the Democratic ticket in this State. He is the largest Democratic manufacturer in Indiana, and is the great exemplar used by the Sentinel to "point the moral and adorn the tale" of free trade.

In the interview in question, however, Mr. Bass comes to the support of the free-trade party at but a halting gait. Mr. B. is a Kentucky Democrat from way back in the palmy days of the war; yet he is not such a free-trader as Messrs. Carlisle and Watterson, Cleveland and Bynum. In the first place, the article and interview disclose that the great bulk of all Mr. Bass's business is the manu-

facture of car wheels—a business in which he has no foreign competition. Says the interview:

"Q.—It is a fact, is it not, that Europe does not produce at all, or to any great extent, the kind of car wheels that we use in this country, and that they cannot very well produce them there?"

"A.—They are not produced there at all, nor could they produce them out of the material that they manufacture there at present."

It is not particularly surprising that Mr. Bass is not worrying about the tariff!

The interview next discloses that he is largely interested in the manufacture of iron for car wheels in Alabama, and that even there, where it is notorious that the negroes are compelled to work at much less wages than our laborers get in Indiana, even in Alabama wages are better than in similar employments abroad. We quote:

"Q.—Is it not the fact that the ore is near the surface of the earth and in close proximity to timber, limestone and bituminous coal in Alabama?"

"A.—Yes, and it would seem to me that with all these advantages in the way of mining both the ore and the coal, and in the possession of timber to make charcoal, as well as the proximity and accessibility of the limestone necessary to be used, that we possess all the advantages for making iron as cheaply as any other country, notwithstanding any disparity that may exist in the matter of wages."

So this apostle of Democracy admits that the wages of Alabama negroes are better than those men similarly employed in England! Are the workmen of Indiana anxious to have their wages reduced below those of the colored men of Alabama, even to the level of the workmen of England? Again Mr. Bass says:

"A.—While I do not approve of the entire removal of the tariff on iron, it having been already put down to a very low point, yet, if some further reduction were made, I do not believe it would have the effect of stopping any furnaces in this country."

Mr. Bass, it seems, regards the tariff on iron as already very low, but thinks "some" further reduction might not stop the furnaces of this country.

With such a doubting, hesitating opinion as this, from a Democratic oracle, is it safe to try the experiment?

But for an opinion as is an opinion the following "takes the cake":

"Q.—What effect in general do you think the tariff has upon the rate of wages for wage-earners?"

"A.—I don't think it has any effect upon the price of labor, as that is governed entirely by supply and demand."

If the price of labor is regulated entirely by supply and demand, we should like to ask Mr. Bass what regulate supply and demand. Does not the encouragement and establishment of American manufactures increase the demand for labor, and would not a flood of foreign goods on all our wharves diminish it? During the last thirty years the average rate of wages for all kinds of labor in the United States has increased more than fifty per cent.

We fully agree with Mr. Bass that this increase of wages is due in a large degree to the increased demand for labor, but we would like to have him state what has caused the increased demand. If he doesn't know, we can inform him that it is due mainly to the protective tariff policy.

As an argument for the free-trade party the interview of Mr. Bass is not a success, and we suggest to the free-trade organ to try again.

THE New York Sun, noticing Roger Q. Mills's dishonest speech in Virginia, in which he argued that the only issue involved in the pending contest over his bill was a matter of 7 per cent. on the rate of duties, says:

"We are against any attempt at humbug, and candor compels us to say that when Mr. Mills points to his failure to cut the tariff down to the full extent he intended, as an argument that he is not for free trade, humbug is the term that fits the case. Mr. Mills's policy will mean that this country's free-trade bill, within twenty years, let him either tell the truth or leave the stump."

We dare the Democratic party and candidates of Indiana to a debate on the fair, square issue of a protective tariff against free-trade or revenue tariff. If they want a debate on "the tariff" they can be accommodated to their heart's content, but they will not be permitted to skulk behind the Republican wagons, as they are attempting to do now. Come out and fight a square, stand-up fight.

MR. THURMAN, at least, has the courage of his convictions. He does not hesitate to denounce the protective tariff up hill and down.

The Chicago Herald, a Democratic paper, says:

"The protective tariff robs the workingman, and Thurman so asserts. The David B. Hills assume that the tariff enriches the workingman, and yet they would reduce it. Their position is not tenable. That of the old Roman is impregnable."

This is business. Why cannot the Democratic party be honest enough to take up the issue and fight on it? Why does almost every Democrat and free-trader show the white feather by running behind the breastwork of protection and filling the air with his dishonest cries that the only issue between the parties is one of 5 or 7 cents? Stand up to the rack, gentlemen.

In his speech last week, in the Kanawha valley, Roger Q. Mills said that to put wool on the free list would increase the price, and thus benefit the farmers and wool-growers. He argued that "the record shows that high tariff has always lowered, while low tariff has raised the price." This is the head-line over the report of his speech in the New York Star, the Democratic administration organ. Is this true? Did Mr. Mills say this, and does the Star mean it? If so, then the Mills bill will increase the cost of clothing, instead of lowering it! Is this the Barmecide feast to which Mr. Mills invites the workmen, whom he has been trying to delude with the cry of cheap clothing? Is it possible for a free-trade Democrat to be honest and candid in this campaign?

MR. BYNUM says "we free-traders" are opposed to a tariff duty on anything that "grows." Statistics just published by the Treasury Department show that during the year ending June 30, 1888, we imported into the United States 15,639,861 dozen eggs; \$8,006,332 worth of live animals; \$8,755,733 worth of breadstuffs, including nearly a half million bushels of wheat; 100,269 tons of hay; 5,684,093 pounds of hops; \$2,088,854 worth of

provisions, comprising meat and dairy products; 1,942,840 bushels of beans and peas, and 8,259,538 bushels of potatoes. Some of these articles pay a duty, while others are free. Mr. Bynum would make them all free. The fact is, our farmers need more protection instead of less.

THE Democratic Advance, of New York, in answer to the question of whether it will support Cleveland, replies, "Is thy servant a dog that it should do this thing?" The natural inference from this, that the Advance does not mean to support Cleveland, is strengthened by its further statements, that it doesn't believe in free trade, doesn't consider Cleveland a good Democrat or a good President, and can't forgive Judge Thurman for his hostility to Samuel J. Tilden. The Advance was established eight years ago as a party organ.

EASTERN Democratic newspapers having announced with great joy that a State officer of Pennsylvania and one of the most prominent Republicans of the southern part of the State had joined the Cleveland ranks, an investigation was in order by surprised Republicans. The "prominent Republican and State officer" turns out to be a night-watchman at the State Capitol, to which place he had been appointed by Governor Beaver. Like all other bolters from Republican ranks, he will immediately be dubbed "Colonel" by his new associates.

THE project for a natural-gas illumination of the city should not be allowed to fail or hang fire. After General Harrison's return there will be a renewal of the visiting delegations and statesmen, and it ought to be burned into them that Indianapolis has natural-gas. We must not hide our light under a bushel.

THE Chicago Current can no longer remain "independent" in politics. The issues of the campaign, it thinks, are so clearly defined as to demand adherence to one side or the other, and it has therefore come out boldly for Harrison, Morton and protection.

THE Washington Post, which affects to be independent, says: "Judged by the views of those Senators who have had the best opportunities for intimate acquaintance with all the details of the fisheries dispute, this treaty ought not to have been confirmed."

In the last year of President Arthur's administration the balance of foreign trade in favor of the United States was \$164,662,426. In the fiscal year ended 30th of last June, the balance against us was \$27,925,174.

COMMODORE HARMONY takes Secretary Whitney's place when the latter runs down to New York. By all accounts Harmony is needed among the New York Democracy more than any one who can be mentioned.

THE Democracy make great pretenses of friendship for the laborer, but they would not give a laboring man who had been robbed of his seat in the House even a hearing, much less an investigation.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal.

A few days ago I addressed an inquiry to the Indianapolis Sentinel worded substantially as follows: "Will the Sentinel be kind enough to settle a dispute between two readers of your valuable paper by quoting the exact language of President Cleveland's letter of acceptance on the subject of a re-election?" Of course this had relation to his letter of acceptance four years ago. The Sentinel has answered my inquiry, but has maintained an insolent silence.

The question was asked for information only, and I do not see why a public journal would refuse to answer a simple question put to it by an American citizen and voter who is an earnest inquirer after the truth. I now put the question to the Journal, which, I hope, will be fully answered.

BRASIL, Aug. 24. Of the Sentinel and Journal.

His letter of acceptance was dated Albany,

Aug. 18, 1884. In it he said:

"When an election to office shall be the selection by the voters of one of their number to assume for a time a public trust, instead of his dedication to the profession of politics when the holders of the ballot, quickened by a sense of duty, shall avow truth betrayed and pledges broken, and when the suffrage shall be altogether free and uncorrupted, the full realization of a government by the people will be at hand. And of the means to this end not one would, in my judgment, be more effective than an amendment to the Constitution disqualifying the President from re-election. When we consider the patronage of this great office, the allurements of power, the temptation to retain public place on any terms, and more than all, the availability of a party finds in an incumbent, whom a horde of office-seekers, with a zeal borne of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come, are ready to aid with money and trained political service, we recognize in the eligibility of the President for re-election a most serious danger to that calm, deliberate and independent political action which must characterize a government by the people."

SENATOR EDMUNDS's letter to the Republican national committee shows his deep interest in the election of Harrison and Morton. The distinguished Senator says:

"All my hopes, my hopes, and wishes are in the success of our candidates in the present campaign. For I really think it is one of the most important crises in the history of our country, particularly as it regards the material welfare and prosperity and happiness of all the people. It is not, therefore, from any embarrassment connected either with our cause or our candidates that I have been obliged to decline public speaking."

It is physically impossible for me to speak out of doors and very nearly so in any large hall filled with people. The wear and tear of nine months of senatorial work, and the not altogether propitious climate of Washington, are so distracting to me that my capacity for work is substantially exhausted for one season."

POLITICAL NOTE AND COMMENT.

R. Q. MILLS had a surplus. Where is that surplus now?—Philadelphia Press.

SOMEbody must have puzzled Thank-God Brooks. He has been very quiet since that rebel speech.—Chicago Journal.